

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 29 has been amended to clarify existing features as would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art without narrowing the scope thereof. No new matter has been added.

Claims 29-47 are pending and under consideration.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because the amendment of claim 29 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and the amendment does not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

On pages 3-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner again rejects claims 29-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Katayama (U.S. Patent 5,902,115). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner clarifies that since Katayama teaches a volume management area 74 having a disk information file 76 to manage movie or music files 78 to decode and simultaneously display video and audio files, Katayama discloses the features of claims 29-47. However, as discussed with the Examiner in the Interview, this disclosure does not meet the requirements of the claims as presented as there remains no area corresponding to the audio area as recited in claim 29.

By way of review, claim 29 recites, among other features, "an audio area including at least one audio title set (ATS), audio data stored in said ATS, and catalog playback information which is stored in the audio area and which is related to the audio data stored in the ATS."

Claim 29 further recites "a predetermined area other than the audio area," where the predetermined area " includes a catalog management (CMG) region having management information on catalog information, and a catalog title set (CTS) having at least one catalog title including the catalog information related to each item of the audio data." As such, claim 29 recites two distinct areas defined by their contents. Moreover, claim 29 further recites "the catalog playback information connecting the audio data and the catalog information to be reproduced during reproduction of the audio data."

In contrast, Katayama discloses a single volume having both audio and video to be reproduced together. Specifically, the disk information file 76 includes information on sequences of titles to be played from within the movie or music files 78 of the same volume, and image data used to construct a menu to select the titles to be played. (Col. 8, line 24 to col. 9, line 14 and lines 22-36; FIGs. 4 and 5). While the files 78 individually include audio, video, and subpictures indicated by the disk information file 76, there is no indication that the disk information file 76 controls reproduction of video in another volume on the disk having other management information, or that the disk information file 76 includes audio data which is reproduced with video and subpictures of the movie or music files 78 according to information in the disk information file 76. Thus, the entire volume suggested in Katayama does not meet the features of claim 29 as discussed with the Examiner.

Additionally, on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner clarifies that the claims do not recite that the audio pack 98 of another file 98 is utilized while the video and sub-picture packs 93, 95 are displayed, or that the video and sub-picture packs 93, 95 of the file 98 are reproduced according to file management information 101 of another file 98 storing the audio being reproduced. However, as discussed with the Examiner in the Interview, this statement relates to the lack of disclosure in Katayama as compared requirements of the claims as presented since there remains no area corresponding to the audio area as recited in claim 29.

Specifically, Katayama teaches that each movie or music file 78 includes corresponding audio, video, and subpictures to be played together in a particular sequence after being selected using the menu. As shown in FIGs. 6-8, the video data area 102 includes data cells 105, with each data cell 105 including an arrangement of packs including a control pack 92, a video pack 93, a sub-picture pack 95, and an audio pack 98. The control pack 92 controls the reproduction of the video pack 93, a sub-picture pack 95, and an audio pack 98 within the same cell 105. (Col. 10, line 22 to col. 11, line 10). However, as shown, the audio pack 98 is stored within a same cell as the video pack 93 and the sub-picture pack 95 and are reproduced using the

control pack 92 and the file management information 101 of the same file 78 containing the audio pack 98 and the video and sub-picture packs 93, 95. There is no suggestion that the audio pack of another file 98 is utilized while the video and sub-picture packs 93, 95 of the present file 98 are displayed, or that the video and sub-picture packs 93, 95 of the file 98 are reproduced according to file management information 101 of another file 98 storing the audio being reproduced. There is further no suggestion that the audio pack of another cell is utilized while the video and sub-picture packs 93, 95 of the present cell 105 are displayed, or that the video and sub-picture packs 93, 95 of the present cell 105 are reproduced according to a control pack of another cell storing the audio being reproduced.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Katayama does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 29.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Katayama does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 33 and 38.

Additionally and as discussed with the Examiner in the interview, Katayama does not suggest that a RAM section 52 stores the video data prior to the audio data to be reproduced being read. In contrast, claim 37 recites, among other features, that "the controller controls the playback signal processing unit to read the catalog information from the second predetermined area and to store the read catalog information in the buffer prior to reading the audio data from the first predetermined area, and reproduces the buffered catalog information while reproducing the read audio data according to the read catalog playback information." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Katayama does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 37.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Katayama does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 47.

Claims 30-32, 34-36, and 39-46 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from corresponding claims 29, 33, and 38.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/924,094

Docket No.: 1293.1059CIPD3

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: FEB. 12, 2007

By: 

James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983

1400 Eye St., N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510